

REMARKS

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 as being anticipated by Levesque et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,830 "Levesque") and has rejected claim 20 as being anticipated by Yamada et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,986,625 "Yamada").

In response to these rejections, applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 20 to incorporate novel limitations thereto. By such amendments, applicant believes that amended claims 1 and 20 are now patentable over the cited prior arts. Detailed explanations are given below.

Regarding claim 1, an optical fiber cable holder fixed on a base plate comprises a clasping portion having a top cover and two side walls depending from opposite sides of the top cover, and a fixing portion fixing the optical fiber cable holder on the base plate. *At least one bent arm extends from at least a side of the top cover other than the sides from which the side walls depend-* to prevent excessive bending of the cables.

Referring to Figure 1 and Column 2 lines 25-28 in the specification of Levesque, Levesque discloses a bottom wall, a top wall, and an arcuate pillar extending between the walls. Levesque also discloses an arcuate retainer arms extending upwardly from the bottom wall. The Examiner argues that Levesque discloses an optical fiber cable holder fixed on a base plate having a clasping portion to hold cables, the clasping portion having at least one bent arm (Figure 1 element 22) to prevent excessive bending of the cables; and Levesque also

discloses a top cover (Figure 1 element 20) and two side walls (Figure 1 elements 16 and 18). However, the bent arm 22 does not extend from a side of the top cover 20 other than the sides from which the two side walls depend. Levesque fails to disclose an optical fiber cable holder having *a top cover and two side walls depending from opposite sides of the top cover, and at least one bent arm extending from other a side of the top cover other than the sides from which the two side walls depend*. Therefore, the optical fiber cable holder of the instant invention has a structure which is significantly different from Levesque's.

For the above-mentioned reasons, independent claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Levesque.

Dependent claims 2-10 are also believed to be patentable since they depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1.

Regarding claim 20, an optical fiber cable assembly of the instant invention includes a base plate and a one-piece holder mounted on the base plate. The holder includes a U-shaped clasp portion including a top cover with a pair of side walls extending downwardly by two sides thereof, a lower locking leg and an upper stop latch being discretely formed on each of the side walls, wherein both the lower locking leg and the upper stop latch are vertically positioned outside of the base plate and horizontally exposed to an exterior.

Yamada discloses essentially a retainer plate (20) fully retainably embedded in the connector body (10) with the projections (23) interferentially engaged within the slot (15) (column 4, lines 39-45). It is hard to find the corresponding structures meeting the limitations of the discrete lower locking leg and upper stop latch which

sandwich the base plate. And needless to say, no corresponding portions in Yamada et al. can be interpreted to be positioned vertically outside of the base plate and horizontally exposed to the exterior.. Therefore, claim 20 should be patentable over Yamada, since it is clearly distinct from the cited reference.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-19 as being unpatentable over Daoud (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,851 "Daoud '851") in view of Daoud (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,772 "Daoud '772").

At first, the applicant is wondering if U.S. Patent No. 6, 456,772 "Daoud '772" was incorrectly written into U.S. Patent No. 6,456,722 "Daoud '722".

In response to this rejection, applicant has amended independent claim 11, adding limitations which define over the prior art cited by the Examiner in this Office Action.

Regarding claim 11, an optical fiber cable holder comprises a clasp portion having a top cover and two side walls **depending downwardly from two opposite sides** thereof, a fixing portion connecting with the side walls of the clasp portion, and at least *one bent arm extending from the top cover*. The examiner argues that the fiber holder of Daoud '851 includes a top cover and two side walls. However, there are spaces between a plurality of top covers in either Daoud '851 or Daoud '772, and the two side walls do not extend from two opposite sides of one of the top covers. In contrast, both the two side walls and the at least one bent arm extend from the same top cover in the instant invention. The instant invention

has a top cover and two side walls depending downwardly from the top cover to define a space for holding fibers, which is not disclosed in the cited references or combinations thereof. Most importantly, a person of ordinary skill in the art couldn't come up with such a structure from reading the combination of Daoud '851 and Daoud '772, since neither Daoud '851 nor Daoud '772 discloses a *bent arm extending from the top cover* to prevent excessive bending of the fibers. The combination of these two references also does not suggest a bent arm extending from the top cover. The Examiner argues that Daoud '851 discloses at least one bent arm extending from the clasp portion to prevent excessive bending of fibers (Figure 3 element 6, right and left extensions of top). However, the right or the left extension of top together with a lower extension defines a semi-annular slot for holding fibers. In other words, the right or left extension is more likely used to hold the fibers. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not see an anti-bending function in the right or left extension of the top from reading the drawings of Daoud '851. *Even if Daoud '851 were combined with Daoud '772, the references would not meet the claims of the instant invention.* The combinations of references cited by the Examiner do not suggested that a bent arm be designed to prevent the fibers from bending, since none of the cited references puts forward such an idea to solve above-mentioned problems. Therefore, it is *nonobvious* to a person of ordinary skill in the art since the structure of the instant invention and the structure of the optical fiber holder described in the cited references are so different.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the amended claim 11 is believed to be in condition for allowance. The amended claims 11-19 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11, so should also be in condition for allowance.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Kun-Tsan Wu
Chun Yu Lee

By 
Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137

FAX RECEIVED

JUN 3 0 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800